## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/665,120 MIYAZAWA, TAKASHI Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner 2629 Stephen G. Sherman All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): 131 Randi Isaacs (1) Stephen G. Sherman. (2) Amr Awad. Date of Interview: 25 January 2007. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 1,6,23 and 24 Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Dawson</u> et al. and Tsuchida et al. Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\square$ was reached. g) $\boxtimes$ was not reached. h) $\square$ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Applicant's representative organized that the mendments to claims 6,23 and 24 dictinguish over the specificances. The examinar will consider the amendments when the amendment 16 received.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required